



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,424	03/25/2004	Ryoichi Kaku	119245	6949
25944	7590	06/04/2008		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			EXAMINER	
			PARK, EDWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ADVISORY ACTION ATTACHMENT TO PAPER NO. 20080527

1. Per the applicant's amendment of claims 10-18 in regards to 35 U.S.C. 101, the previous claim rejections are withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejections to the claims stand over the art of record, for the following reasons:

Regarding **claims 1, 10**, applicant argues that the limitation, "disposing in the object space a model object including a plurality of part objects each which has a projection shape, each of the parts having a projecting portion formed on a display surface on which an image is drawn", is not disclosed by Mukoyama. Applicant explicitly argues that the "projecting portion" is not taught by the reference. This argument is not considered persuasive since the "projecting portion" does not distinguish itself from a portion within the shape and is met by the Mukoyama reference within figure 16. A projecting portion is reasonably interpreted as a subset of the shape formed on a display surface as an image.

Regarding **claims 3, 12**, applicant argues that the limitation, "mapping on each of the part objects the Z texture for forming a virtual projection shape on the display surface of the part objects by pixel unit", is not disclosed by the combination of references. The applicant explicitly argues that Nakagawa does not relate to using a Z-buffer to form a virtual projection shape, e.g. to set bump shapes on the display surface. In response to applicant's argument that the

references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "using a Z-buffer to form a virtual projection shape, e.g. to set bump shapes on the display surface") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Examiner interprets mapping Z texture for forming a virtual projection shape as equivalent to displaying depth through a virtual projection shape which is seen in figure 3, paragraph [0104]). Therefore, the claim limitations for claims 3, 12 are met and can be seen in the final rejection.

Regarding **claims 2, 4-9, 11, 13-18**, applicant argues that the dependent claims are patentable due to the dependency from claims 1, 3, 10 and 12 respectively. This argument is not considered persuasive since the rejection stands for claims 1, 3, 10 and 12.